| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | 10/662,993 | MAYS, TODD A. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | David E. Bochna | 3679 |
| All Participants: Status of Application: | | |
| (1) David E. Bochna. | (3) | |
| (2) <u>Larry Henneman, Jr.</u> . | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: <u>13 September 2005</u> | Time: | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: | | |
| Claims discussed: | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER | PAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS | S DISCUSSED: |
| A phone call was made to determine the status of the case. Mr. Henneman stated that the case was intended to go abandoned | | |
| Part III. | | |
| □ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | · | |
| | | |
| Dand Bal | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant | Applicant's Representative Si | gnature – if appropriate) |